arXiv:astro-ph/9401007v1 7 Jan 1994

Caltech GRP-375; MIT-AT-94-01; IASSNS-AST-94/1

Cosmological Perturbation Theory in the Synchronous vs. Conformal Newtonian Gauge

Chung-Pei Ma
Theoretical Astrophysics 130-33, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125
and

Edmund Bertschinger[1]
Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

ABSTRACT

We present a systematic treatment of the linear theory of scalar gravitational perturbations in the synchronous gauge and the conformal Newtonian (or longitudinal) gauge. We first derive the transformation law relating the two gauges. We then write down in parallel in both gauges the coupled, linearized Boltzmann, Einstein and fluid equations that govern the evolution of the metric perturbations and the density fluctuations of the particle species. The particle species considered include cold dark matter (CDM), baryons, photons, massless neutrinos, and massive neutrinos (a hot dark matter or HDM candidate), where the CDM and baryon components are treated as fluids while a detailed phase-space description is given to the photons and neutrinos. The linear evolution equations presented are applicable to any $\Omega = 1$ model with CDM or a mixture of CDM and HDM. Isentropic initial conditions on super-horizon scales are derived. The equations are solved numerically in both gauges for a CDM+HDM model with $\Omega_{\rm cold} = 0.65$, $\Omega_{\rm hot} = 0.3$, and $\Omega_{\rm baryon} = 0.05$. We discuss the evolution of the metric and the density perturbations and compare their different behaviors outside the horizon in the two gauges. In a companion paper we integrate the geodesic equations for the neutrino particles in the perturbed conformal Newtonian background metric computed here. The purpose is to obtain an accurate sampling of the neutrino phase space for the HDM initial conditions in N-body simulations of the CDM+HDM models.

Submitted to *The Astrophysical Journal*
January 1994

Subject headings: cosmology: theory — large-scale structure of universe — gravitation

[1]Also Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540

1. Introduction

The theory of galaxy formation based on gravitational instability is aimed at describing how primordially-generated fluctuations in matter and radiation grow into galaxies and clusters of galaxies due to self-gravity. A perturbation theory can be formulated when the amplitudes of the fluctuations are small, and the growth of the fluctuations can be solved from the linear theory. Such linear theory for a perturbed Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe was first developed by Lifshitz (1946), later reviewed in Lifshitz & Khalatnikov (1963). The subsequent work can be found summarized in the textbooks by Weinberg (1972) and Peebles (1980), and in the reviews by Kodama & Sasaki (1984) and Mukhanov, Feldman & Brandenberger (1992).

In the early universe, gravitational perturbations are inflated to wavelengths beyond the horizon at the end of the inflationary epoch. Fluctuations of a given length scale reenter the horizon at a later time when the horizon has grown to the size of the fluctuations. Although the process of galaxy formation in recent epochs is well described by Newtonian gravity (and other microphysical processes such as hydrodynamics), a general relativistic treatment is required for perturbations on scales larger than the horizon size before the horizon crossing time. The use of general relativity brought in the issue of gauge freedom which has caused some confusion over the years. Lifshitz (1946) adopted the "synchronous gauge" for his coordinate system, which has since become the most commonly used gauge for cosmological perturbation theories. However, some complications associated with this gauge such as the appearance of coordinate singularities and spurious gauge modes prompted Bardeen (1980) and others (e.g. Kodama & Sasaki, 1984) to formulate alternative approaches that deal only with gauge-invariant quantities. A thorough review of the gauge-invariant perturbation theory and its appliaiton to texture-seeded structure formation models is given by Durrer (1993). Another possibility is to adopt a different gauge. We will discus in detail in this paper the conformal Newtonian (or the longitudinal) gauge (Mukhanov et al. 1992), which is a particularly convenient gauge to use for scalar perturbations.

This paper serves two purposes. First, it is an independent paper in which we present and compare a systematic treatment of the linear theory of scalar isentropic gravitational perturbations in the synchronous and conformal Newtonian gauges. The coupled, linearized Einstein, Boltzmann, and fluid equations for the metric and density perturbations are presented in parallel in the two gauges. We give a full discussion of the evolution of five particle species: cold dark matter (CDM), hot dark matter (HDM, i.e., massive neutrinos), baryons, photons, and massless neutrinos. The CDM and the baryon components behave like collisionless and collisional fluids, respectively, while the photons and the neutrinos require a phase-space description governed by the Boltzmann transport equation. We also derive analytically the time dependence of the perturbations on scales larger than the horizon to illustrate the dependence on the gauge choice. This information is needed in the initial conditions for the numerical integration of the evolution equations. The linear theory discussed in this paper can be applied to $\Omega = 1$ models with various dark matter compositions, e.g., pure CDM, pure HDM, or a mixture of CDM and HDM.

This paper also serves as a companion paper to Ma & Bertschinger (1994) in which we reported the main results from our linear calculation of the full neutrino phase space in a CDM+HDM model with $\Omega_{\rm cold} = 0.65$, $\Omega_{\rm hot} = 0.3$, $\Omega_{\rm baryon} = 0.05$, and $H_0 = 50$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}. (The corresponding neutrino mass is $m_\nu = 6.985$ eV.) The motivation was to obtain an accurate sampling of the neutrino phase space for the HDM initial conditions in N-body simulations of structure formation in CDM+HDM models. We adopted a two-step Monte Carlo procedure to achieve this goal: (1) Integrate the coupled, linearized Boltzmann, Einstein, and fluid equations for all particle species in the model (i.e., CDM, HDM, photons, baryons and massless neutrinos) to obtain the evolution of the metric perturbations; (2) Follow the trajectories of individual neutrinos by integrating the geodesic equations using the metric computed in (1). Since no coordinate singularities occur in the conformal Newtonian gauge and the geodesic equations have simple forms, the geodesic integration in step (2) was carried out in this gauge, starting shortly after neutrino decoupling at redshift $z \sim 10^9$ until $z = 13.5$. We focus on step (1) in this paper. Following historical precedents, we first developed the code for the Boltzmann integration in the synchronous gauge. The transformation relating the synchronous gauge and the conformal Newtonian gauge was then derived and used to compute the metric perturbations in the latter gauge for step (2) of the calculation. Subsequently we developed a code to perform the full integration in the conformal Newtonian gauge.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In §2 we write down the metric for the two gauges and summarize their properties. In §3, we derive the gauge transformation relating two arbitrary gauges and obtain the transformation between the synchronous and the conformal Newtonian gauges. The linearized evolution equations for the metric and the density perturbations are given in §§4 and 5. Section 4 discusses the Einstein equations with emphasis on the source terms, the energy-momentum tensor, in the two gauges. The perturbed fluid equations are derived from the energy-momentum conservation, which are applied to CDM and the baryons in §5. The rest of §5 contains detailed treatments of the photon and neutrino phase space distributions, recombination, and the coupling of photons and baryons. The photon and neutrino distribution functions are expanded in Legendre polynomials, reducing the linearized Boltzmann equation to a set of coupled ordinary differential equations for the expansion modes. The massive neutrinos require a slightly more complicated treatment due to the nontrivial time dependence of the energy-momentum relation. Section 6 discusses the behavior of the perturbations before horizon crossing. The necessary initial conditions for the variables in the two gauges are given. Section 7 presents the numerical results for the evolution of the perturbations in our CDM+HDM model.

2. The Two Gauges

We consider only spatially flat ($\Omega = 1$) background spacetimes with isentropic scalar metric perturbations. The spacetime coordinates are denoted by x^μ, $\mu \in (0, 1, 2, 3)$, where x^0 is the

time component and x^i, $i \in (1,2,3)$ are the spatial components in Cartesian coordinates. Greek letters α, β, γ and so on always run from 0 to 3, labeling the four spacetime-coordinates; Roman letters such as i, j, k always run from 1 to 3, labeling the spatial parts of a four-vector. Repeated indices are summed. Since our interests lie in the physics in an expanding universe, we use comoving coordinates $x^\mu = (\tau, \vec{x})$ with the expansion factor $a(\tau)$ of the universe factored out. The comoving coordinates are related to the proper time and positions t and $\vec{r}$ by $dx^0 = d\tau = dt/a(\tau)$, $d\vec{x} = d\vec{r}/a(\tau)$. Dots will denote derivatives with respect to τ: $\dot{a} \equiv \partial a/\partial\tau$. The speed of light c is set to unity.

The components g_{00} and g_{0i} of the metric tensor in the synchronous gauge is by definition unperturbed. The line element is given by

$$ds^2 = a^2(\tau)\{-d\tau^2 + (\delta_{ij} + h_{ij})dx^i dx^j\}\,. \tag{1}$$

The metric perturbation h_{ij} can be decomposed into a trace part $h \equiv h_{ii}$ and a traceless part consisting of three pieces, $h^{\parallel}_{ij}, h^{\perp}_{ij}$, and h^T_{ij}, where $h_{ij} = h\delta_{ij}/3 + h^{\parallel}_{ij} + h^{\perp}_{ij} + h^T_{ij}$. By definition, the divergences of $h^{\parallel}_{ij}$ and $h^{\perp}_{ij}$ (which are vectors) are longitudinal and transverse, respectively, and h^T_{ij} is transverse, satisfying

$$\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_j\partial_l h^{\parallel}_{lk} = 0\,, \qquad \partial_i\partial_j h^{\perp}_{ij} = 0\,, \qquad \partial_i h^T_{ij} = 0\,. \tag{2}$$

It then follows that $h^{\parallel}_{ij}$ can be written in terms of some scalar field Λ and $h^{\perp}_{ij}$ in terms of some divergenceless vector $\vec{A}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} h^{\parallel}_{ij} &= \left(\partial_i\partial_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}\nabla^2\right)\Lambda\,, \\ h^{\perp}_{ij} &= \partial_i A_j + \partial_j A_i\,, \qquad \partial_i A_i = 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The two scalar fields h and Λ (or $h^{\parallel}_{ij}$) characterize the scalar mode of the metric perturbations, while A_i (or $h^{\perp}_{ij}$) and h^T_{ij} represent the vector and the tensor modes, respectively.

We will be working in the Fourier space k in this paper. We introduce two fields $h(\vec{k},\tau)$ and $\eta(\vec{k},\tau)$ in k-space and write the scalar mode of h_{ij} as a Fourier integral

$$h_{ij}(\vec{x},\tau) = \int d^3k e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}}\left\{\hat{k}_i\hat{k}_j h(\vec{k},\tau) + (\hat{k}_i\hat{k}_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij})\,6\eta(\vec{k},\tau)\right\}\,, \quad \vec{k} = k\hat{k}\,. \tag{4}$$

Note that h is used to denote the trace of h_{ij} in both the real space and the Fourier space.

In spite of its wide-spread use, there are serious disadvantages associated with the synchronous gauge. Since the choice of the initial hypersurface and its coordinate assignments are arbitrary, the synchronous gauge conditions do not fix the gauge degrees of freedom completely. Such residual gauge freedom is manifested in the spurious gauge modes contained in the solutions to the equations for the density perturbations. The appearance of these modes has caused some confusion over the years and prompted Bardeen (1980) to formulate alternative approaches that

deal only with gauge-invariant quantities. Another difficulty with the synchronous gauge is that since the coordinates are defined by freely falling observers, coordinate singularities arise when two observers' trajectories intersect each other: a point in spacetime will have two coordinate labels. A different initial hypersurface of constant time has to be chosen to remove these singularities.

The conformal Newtonian gauge (also known as the longitudinal gauge) advocated by Mukhanov et al. (1992) is a particularly simple gauge to use for the scalar mode of metric perturbations. The perturbations are characterized by two scalar potentials ψ and ϕ which appear in the line element as

$$ds^2 = a^2(\tau)\left\{-(1+2\psi)d\tau^2 + (1-2\phi)dx^i dx_i\right\} . \tag{5}$$

It should be emphasized that the conformal Newtonian gauge is a restricted gauge since the metric is applicable only for the scalar mode of the metric perturbations; the vector and the tensor degrees of freedom are eliminated from the beginning. Nonetheless, it can be easily generalized to include the vector and the tensor modes. We will confine our discussion here to the scalar perturbations only.

One advantage of working in this gauge is that the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ is diagonal. This simplifies the calculations and leads to simple geodesic equations (Ma & Bertschinger 1994). Another advantage is that ψ plays the role of the gravitational potential in the Newtonian limit and thus has a simple physical interpretation. Moreover, the two scalar potentials ψ and ϕ in this gauge are identical (up to a minus sign) to the gauge-invariant variables Φ_A and Φ_H Bardeen constructed (1980). No gauge modes are present in this gauge to obscure the meaning of the physical modes since the gauge freedom is completely fixed for $\Omega = 1$ aside from the addition of spatial constants to ψ and ϕ. The second scalar ϕ is required when the energy-momentum tensor $T^{\mu}{}_{\nu}$ contains a nonvanishing traceless and longitudinal component. As we will see in equation (21) and the Einstein equation (22d), this component provides the source term for the constraint equation for $(\phi - \psi)$. When this component is absent, the two scalar potentials ψ and ϕ are identical.

3. Gauge Transformations

In this section we first derive the transformation law relating two arbitrary gauges. From it, the gauge transformation relating the synchronous gauge and the conformal Newtonian gauge is readily obtained.

A perturbed flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker metric can be written in general as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{00} &= -a^2(\tau)\,\{1+2\psi(\vec{x},\tau)\}\,, \\ g_{0i} &= -a^2(\tau)\,w_i(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \\ g_{ij} &= a^2(\tau)\,\{[1-2\phi(\vec{x},\tau)]\delta_{ij} + \sigma_{ij}(\vec{x},\tau)\}\,, \qquad \sigma_{ii}=0 \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where the functions ψ, ϕ, w_i and σ_{ij} represent metric perturbations about the Robertson-Walker spacetime and are assumed to be small compared with unity. The trace part of the perturbation to g_{ij} is absorbed in ϕ, and σ_{ij} is taken to be traceless.

Consider a general coordinate transformation from a coordinate system x^μ to another $\hat{x}^\mu$

$$x^\mu \to \hat{x}^\mu = x^\mu + d^\mu(x^\nu)\,. \tag{7}$$

We write the time and the spatial parts separately as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}^0 &= x^0 + \alpha(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \\ \hat{\vec{x}} &= \vec{x} + \vec{\nabla}\beta(\vec{x},\tau) + \vec{\epsilon}(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \quad \vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{\epsilon} = 0\,, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the vector $\vec{d}$ has been decomposed into a longitudinal component $\vec{\nabla}\beta$ ($\vec{\nabla}\times\vec{\nabla}\beta = 0$) and a transverse component $\vec{\epsilon}$ ($\vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{\epsilon} = 0$). The requirement that ds^2 be invariant under this coordinate transformation leads to

$$\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x) = g_{\mu\nu}(x) - g_{\mu\beta}(x)\partial_\nu d^\beta - g_{\alpha\nu}(x)\partial_\mu d^\alpha - d^\alpha\partial_\alpha g_{\mu\nu}(x) + O(d^2)\,. \tag{9}$$

We note that both sides of this equation are evaluated at the same coordinate values x in the two gauges, which do not correspond to the same physical point in general. Assuming d^μ to be of the same order as the metric perturbations ψ, w_i, ϕ and σ_{ij}, the metric perturbations in the two coordinate systems are related to first order in the perturbed quantities by

$$\hat{\psi}(\vec{x},\tau) = \psi(\vec{x},\tau) - \dot{\alpha}(\vec{x},\tau) - \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\alpha(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \tag{10a}$$

$$\hat{w}_i(\vec{x},\tau) = w_i(\vec{x},\tau) + \partial_i\alpha(\vec{x},\tau) - \partial_i\dot{\beta}(\vec{x},\tau) - \dot{\epsilon}_i(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \tag{10b}$$

$$\hat{\phi}(\vec{x},\tau) = \phi(\vec{x},\tau) + \frac{1}{3}\nabla^2\beta(\vec{x},\tau) + \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\alpha(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \tag{10c}$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(\vec{x},\tau) = \sigma_{ij}(\vec{x},\tau) - 2\left\{\left(\partial_i\partial_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}\nabla^2\right)\beta(\vec{x},\tau) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\partial_i\epsilon_j + \partial_j\epsilon_i\right)\right\}\,. \tag{10d}$$

We can further decompose the transformations of w_i and σ_{ij} above into longitudinal and transverse parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}_i^{\parallel}(\vec{x},\tau) &= w_i^{\parallel}(\vec{x},\tau) + \partial_i\alpha(\vec{x},\tau) - \partial_i\dot{\beta}(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \\ \hat{w}_i^{\perp}(\vec{x},\tau) &= w_i^{\perp}(\vec{x},\tau) - \dot{\epsilon}_i(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{\parallel}(\vec{x},\tau) &= \sigma_{ij}^{\parallel}(\vec{x},\tau) - 2\left(\partial_i\partial_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}\nabla^2\right)\beta(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \\ \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{\perp}(\vec{x},\tau) &= \sigma_{ij}^{\perp}(\vec{x},\tau) - \left(\partial_i\epsilon_j + \partial_j\epsilon_i\right)\,, \\ \hat{\sigma}_{ij}^{T}(\vec{x},\tau) &= \sigma_{ij}^{T}(\vec{x},\tau)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $w_i = w_i^{\parallel} + w_i^{\perp}$, $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}^{\parallel} + \sigma_{ij}^{\perp} + \sigma_{ij}^{T}$, and $\sigma_{ij}^{\parallel}$, $\sigma_{ij}^{\perp}$ and σ_{ij}^{T} obey equation (2). Equations (10)–(12) describe the transformation of metric perturbations under a general infinitesimal coordinate transformation.

We can now use equations (10) to relate the scalar metric perturbations (ϕ, ψ) in the conformal Newtonian gauge to $h_{ij} = h\delta_{ij}/3 + h_{ij}^{\parallel}$ in the synchronous gauge. Let $\hat{x}^\mu$ denote the synchronous coordinates and x^μ the conformal Newtonian coordinates with $\hat{x}^\mu = x^\mu + d^\mu$. From equations (11) and (12), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(\vec{x},\tau) &= \dot{\beta}(\vec{x},\tau) + \chi(\tau)\,, && \text{(13a)}\\
\epsilon_i(\vec{x},\tau) &= \epsilon_i(\vec{x})\,, && \text{(13b)}\\
h_{ij}^{\parallel}(\vec{x},\tau) &= -2\left(\partial_i\partial_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}\nabla^2\right)\beta(\vec{x},\tau)\,, && \text{(13c)}\\
\partial_i\epsilon_j + \partial_j\epsilon_i &= 0\,, && \text{(13d)}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\chi(\tau)$ is an arbitrary function of time, reflecting the gauge freedom associated with the coordinate transformation: $\hat{x}^0 = x^0 + \chi(\tau)$, $\hat{x}^i = x^i$. This transformation corresponds to a global redefinition of the units of time with no physical significance; therefore we shall set $\chi = 0$ from now on. From equations (10a) and (10c) we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\vec{x},\tau) &= +\ddot{\beta}(\vec{x},\tau) + \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\beta}(\vec{x},\tau)\,,\\
\phi(\vec{x},\tau) &= -\frac{1}{6}h(\vec{x},\tau) - \frac{1}{3}\nabla^2\beta(\vec{x},\tau) - \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\beta}(\vec{x},\tau)\,, && \text{(14)}
\end{aligned}$$

and β is determined by $h^{\parallel}$ in equation (13c).

In terms of h and η introduced in equation (4), $h_{ij}^{\parallel}$ in the synchronous gauge is given by

$$h_{ij}^{\parallel}(\vec{x},\tau) = \int d^3k\, e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}}\,(\hat{k}_i\hat{k}_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij})\left\{h(\vec{k},\tau) + 6\eta(\vec{k},\tau)\right\}\,, \quad \vec{k} = k\hat{k}\,. \tag{15}$$

Comparing $h_{ij}^{\parallel}$ in equations (13c) and (15), we can read off β:

$$\beta(\vec{x},\tau) = \int d^3k\, e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}}\,\frac{1}{2k^2}\left\{h(\vec{k},\tau) + 6\eta(\vec{k},\tau)\right\}\,. \tag{16}$$

Then from equations (14), the conformal Newtonian potentials ϕ and ψ are related to the synchronous potentials h and η in k-space by

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\vec{k},\tau) &= \frac{1}{2k^2}\left\{\ddot{h}(\vec{k},\tau) + 6\ddot{\eta}(\vec{k},\tau) + \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\left[\dot{h}(\vec{k},\tau) + 6\dot{\eta}(\vec{k},\tau)\right]\right\}\,,\\
\phi(\vec{k},\tau) &= \eta(\vec{k},\tau) - \frac{1}{2k^2}\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\left[\dot{h}(\vec{k},\tau) + 6\dot{\eta}(\vec{k},\tau)\right]\,. && \text{(17)}
\end{aligned}$$

The other components of the metric perturbations, $w_i, \sigma_{ij}^{\perp}$, and σ_{ij}^{T}, are zero in both gauges.

4. Einstein Equations and Energy-Momentum Conservation

For a homogeneous Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe with energy density $\bar{\rho}(\tau)$ and pressure $\bar{P}(\tau)$, the Einstein equations give the following evolution equations for the expansion factor $a(\tau)$:

$$\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi}{3}Ga^2\bar{\rho} - \kappa\,, \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right) = -\frac{4\pi}{3}Ga^2(\bar{\rho} + 3\bar{P})\,, \tag{19}$$

where the dots denote derivatives with respect to τ, and κ is positive, zero, or negative for a closed, flat, or open universe, respectively. We consider only $\Omega = 1$ models in this paper, so we set $\kappa = 0$. It follows that the expansion factor scales as $a \propto \tau$ in the radiation-dominated era and $a \propto \tau^2$ in the matter-dominated era.

We find it most convenient to solve the linearized Einstein equations in the two gauges in the Fourier space k. In the synchronous gauge, the scalar perturbations are characterized by $h(\vec{k},\tau)$ and $\eta(\vec{k},\tau)$ in equation (4). In terms of h and η, the time-time, longitudinal time-space, trace space-space, and longitudinal traceless space-space parts of the Einstein equations give the following four equations to linear order in k-space:

Synchronous gauge —

$$k^2\eta - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{h} = 4\pi Ga^2\delta T^0{}_0(\mathrm{Syn})\,, \tag{20a}$$

$$k^2\dot{\eta} = 4\pi Ga^2(\bar{\rho} + \bar{P})\theta(\mathrm{Syn})\,, \tag{20b}$$

$$\ddot{h} + 2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{h} - 2k^2\eta = -8\pi Ga^2\delta T^i{}_i(\mathrm{Syn})\,, \tag{20c}$$

$$\ddot{h} + 6\ddot{\eta} + 2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\left(\dot{h} + 6\dot{\eta}\right) - 2k^2\eta = -24\pi Ga^2(\bar{\rho} + \bar{P})\Theta(\mathrm{Syn})\,. \tag{20d}$$

The label "Syn" is used to distinguish the components of the energy-momentum tensor in the synchronous gauge from those in the conformal Newtonian gauge. The variables θ and Θ are defined as

$$(\bar{\rho} + \bar{P})\theta \equiv ik^j\delta T^0{}_j\,, \qquad (\bar{\rho} + \bar{P})\Theta \equiv -(\hat{k}_i\hat{k}_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij})\Sigma^i{}_j\,, \tag{21}$$

and $\Sigma^i{}_j \equiv T^i{}_j - \delta^i{}_j T^k{}_k/3$ denotes the traceless component of $T^i{}_j$. When the different components of matter and radiation (i.e., CDM, HDM, baryons, photons, and massless neutrinos) are treated separately, $(\bar{\rho} + \bar{P})\theta = \sum_i(\bar{\rho}_i + \bar{P}_i)\theta_i$ and $(\bar{\rho} + \bar{P})\Theta = \sum_i(\bar{\rho}_i + \bar{P}_i)\Theta_i$, where the index i runs over the particle species.

In the conformal Newtonian gauge, the first-order perturbed Einstein equations give

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$k^2\phi + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\left(\dot{\phi} + \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\psi\right) = 4\pi Ga^2\delta T^0{}_0(\mathrm{Con})\,, \tag{22a}$$

$$k^2\left(\dot{\phi}+\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\psi\right) = 4\pi G a^2(\bar{\rho}+\bar{P})\theta(\mathrm{Con})\,, \tag{22b}$$

$$\ddot{\phi}+\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\dot{\psi}+2\dot{\phi})+\left(2\frac{\ddot{a}}{a}-\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2}\right)\psi+\frac{k^2}{3}(\phi-\psi) = \frac{4\pi}{3}Ga^2\delta T^i{}_i(\mathrm{Con})\,, \tag{22c}$$

$$k^2(\phi-\psi) = 12\pi G a^2(\bar{\rho}+\bar{P})\Theta(\mathrm{Con})\,, \tag{22d}$$

where "Con" labels the conformal Newtonian coordinates. Next we will derive the transformation relating $\delta T^\mu{}_\nu$ in the two gauges.

For a perfect fluid of energy density ρ and pressure P, the energy-momentum tensor has the form

$$T^\mu{}_\nu = Pg^\mu{}_\nu + (\rho+P)U^\mu U_\nu\,, \tag{23}$$

where $U^\mu = dx^\mu/\sqrt{-ds^2}$ is the four-velocity of the fluid. The pressure P and energy density ρ of a perfect fluid at a given point are defined to be the pressure and energy density measured by a comoving observer at rest with the fluid at the instant of measurements. For a fluid moving with a small coordinate velocity $v^i \equiv dx^i/d\tau$, v^i can be treated as a perturbation of the same order as $\delta\rho = \rho - \bar{\rho}$, $\delta P = P - \bar{P}$, and the metric perturbations. Then to linear order in the perturbations the energy-momentum tensor is given by

$$\begin{aligned} T^0{}_0 &= -(\bar{\rho}+\delta\rho)\,, \\ T^0{}_i &= (\bar{\rho}+\bar{P})v_i = -T^i{}_0\,, \\ T^i{}_j &= (\bar{P}+\delta P)\delta^i{}_j + \Sigma^i{}_j\,, \qquad \Sigma^i{}_i = 0\,, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where we have allowed an anisotropic shear perturbation $\Sigma^i{}_j$ in $T^i{}_j$. As we shall see, since the photons are tightly coupled to the baryons before recombination, the dominant contribution to this shear stress comes from the neutrinos. We note that for a fluid, θ defined in equation (21) is simply the divergence of the fluid velocity: $\theta = ik^j v_j$.

The energy-momentum tensor $T^\mu{}_\nu(\mathrm{Syn})$ in the synchronous gauge is related to $T^\mu{}_\nu(\mathrm{Con})$ in the conformal Newtonian gauge by the transformation

$$T^\mu{}_\nu(\mathrm{Syn}) = \frac{\partial\hat{x}^\mu}{\partial x^\sigma}\frac{\partial x^\rho}{\partial\hat{x}^\nu}T^\sigma{}_\rho(\mathrm{Con})\,, \tag{25}$$

where $\hat{x}^\mu$ and x^μ denote the synchronous and the conformal Newtonian coordinates, respectively. It follows that to linear order, $T^0{}_0(\mathrm{Syn}) = T^0{}_0(\mathrm{Con})\,, T^0{}_j(\mathrm{Syn}) = T^0{}_j(\mathrm{Con}) + ik_j\alpha(\bar{\rho}+\bar{P})\,$, and $T^i{}_j(\mathrm{Syn}) = T^i{}_j(\mathrm{Con})\,$, where $\alpha = \hat{x}^0 - x^0 = (\dot{h}+6\dot{\eta})/2k^2$ in k-space from equations (13a) and (16). Let $\delta \equiv \delta\rho/\bar{\rho} = -\delta T^0{}_0/\bar{\rho}$. Evaluating the perturbations at the same spacetime coordinate values, we obtain

$$\delta(\mathrm{Syn}) = \delta(\mathrm{Con}) - \alpha\frac{\dot{\bar{\rho}}}{\bar{\rho}}\,, \tag{26a}$$

$$\theta(\mathrm{Syn}) = \theta(\mathrm{Con}) - \alpha k^2\,, \tag{26b}$$

$$\delta P(\mathrm{Syn}) = \delta P(\mathrm{Con}) - \alpha\dot{\bar{P}}\,, \tag{26c}$$

$$\Theta(\mathrm{Syn}) = \Theta(\mathrm{Con})\,. \tag{26d}$$

This transformation also applies to individual species when more than one particle species contributes to the energy-momentum tensor, provided that the appropriate $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{P}$ are used for each component.

The non-relativistic fluid description is appropriate for the CDM and the baryon components. The photon and the neutrino components, however, can be appropriately described only by their full distribution functions in phase space. The energy-momentum tensor in this case is expressed through integrals over momenta of the distribution functions. We will discuss it in detail in §5.

The conservation of energy-momentum is a consequence of the Einstein equations. Let $w \equiv P/\rho$ describe the equation of state. Then the perturbed part of energy-momentum conservation equations

$$T^{\mu\nu}{}_{;\mu} = \partial_\mu T^{\mu\nu} + \Gamma^\nu{}_{\alpha\beta} T^{\alpha\beta} + \Gamma^\alpha{}_{\alpha\beta} T^{\nu\beta} = 0 \tag{27}$$

in k-space implies

Synchronous gauge —

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\delta} &= -(1+w)\left(\theta + \frac{\dot{h}}{2}\right) - 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\left(\frac{\delta P}{\delta\rho} - w\right)\delta\,, \\ \dot{\theta} &= -\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(1-3w)\theta - \frac{\dot{w}}{1+w}\theta + \frac{\delta P/\delta\rho}{1+w}\,k^2\delta - k^2\Theta\,, \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\delta} &= -(1+w)\left(\theta - 3\dot{\phi}\right) - 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\left(\frac{\delta P}{\delta\rho} - w\right)\delta\,, \\ \dot{\theta} &= -\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(1-3w)\theta - \frac{\dot{w}}{1+w}\theta + \frac{\delta P/\delta\rho}{1+w}\,k^2\delta - k^2\Theta + k^2\psi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

These equations are valid for a single uncoupled fluid, or for the net (mass-averaged) δ and θ for all fluids. They need to be modified for individual components if the components interact with each other. An example is the baryonic fluid in our model, which couples to the photons before recombination via Thomson scattering. In the next section we will show that an extra term representing momentum transfer between the two components needs to be added to the $\dot{\delta}$ equation for the baryons.

For the isentropic primordial perturbations considered in this paper, the equations above simplify since $\delta P/\delta\rho = c_s^2 = w$, where c_s is the adiabatic sound speed in the fluid. Although entropy is generated from the coupling of baryons and photons before recombination, it is a first-order perturbation and only appears in the energy-momentum conservation equations in the second order. Thus the terms proportional to $(\delta P/\delta\rho - w)$ above can be neglected when the equations are applied to CDM and baryons in the next section. Even in the case of isocurvature models, which may have large entropy perturbations ab initio, these terms are generally small.

5. Evolution Equations for Matter and Radiation

5.1. Phase Space and the Boltzmann Equation

A phase space is described by six variables: three positions x^i and their conjugate momenta P_i. Our treatment of phase space is based on the time-slicing of a definite gauge (synchronous or conformal Newtonian). Although this approach is not manifestly covariant, it yields correct results provided we convert gauge-dependent quantities to observables at the end of our computation.

The conjugate momentum has the property that it is simply the spatial part of the 4-momentum with lower indices, i.e., for a particle of mass m, $P_i = mU_i$, where $U_i = dx_i/\sqrt{-ds^2}$. One can verify that the conjugate momentum is related to the proper momentum $p^i = p_i$ measured by an observer at a fixed spatial coordinate value by

$$\begin{aligned} P_i &= a(\delta_{ij} + \tfrac{1}{2}h_{ij})p^j\,, && \text{in synchronous gauge}\,, \\ P_i &= a(1-\phi)p_i\,, && \text{in conformal Newtonian gauge}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

In the absence of metric perturbations, Hamilton's equations imply that the conjugate momenta are constant, so the proper momenta redshift as a^{-1}.

The phase space distribution of the particles gives the number of particles in a differential volume $dx^1dx^2dx^3dP_1dP_2dP_3$ in phase space:

$$f(x^i, P_j, \tau)dx^1dx^2dx^3dP_1dP_2dP_3 = dN\ . \tag{31}$$

Importantly, f is a scalar and is invariant under canonical transformations. The zeroth-order phase space distribution is the Fermi-Dirac distribution for fermions (+ sign) and the Bose-Einstein distribution for bosons (− sign):

$$f_0 = f_0(\epsilon) = \frac{g_s}{h_{\rm P}^3}\frac{1}{e^{\epsilon/k_{\rm B}T_0} \pm 1}\,, \tag{32}$$

where $\epsilon = a(p^2 + m^2)^{1/2} = (P^2 + a^2m^2)^{1/2}$, $T_0 = aT$ denotes the temperature of the particles today, the factor g_s is the number of spin degrees of freedom, and $h_{\rm P}$ and $k_{\rm B}$ are the Planck and the Boltzmann constants.

When the spacetime is perturbed, x^i and P_i remain canonically conjugate variables, with equations of motion given by Hamilton's equations (Bertschinger 1993). However, following common practice (e.g., Bond & Szalay 1983) we shall find it convenient to replace P_j by $q_j \equiv ap_j$ in order to eliminate the metric perturbations from the definition of the momenta. Moreover, we shall write the comoving 3-momentum q_j in terms of its magnitude and direction: $q_j = qn_j$ where $n^in_i = \delta_{ij}n^in^j = 1$. Thus, we change our phase space variables, replacing $f(x^i, P_j, \tau)$ by $f(x^i, q, n_j, \tau)$. While this is not a canonical transformation (i.e., q_i is not the momentum conjugate

to x^i), it is perfectly valid provided that we correctly transform the momenta in Hamilton's equations. Note that we do not transform f. Because q_j are not the conjugate momenta, $d^3x d^3q$ is not the phase space volume element, and $f d^3x d^3q$ is not the particle number. In the conformal Newtonian gauge, for example, $(1-3\phi) f d^3x d^3q$ is the particle number; this result is sensible because $a(1-\phi)dx^i$ is the proper distance.

In the perturbed case we shall continue to define ϵ as $a(\tau)$ times the proper energy measured by a comoving observer, $\epsilon = (q^2 + a^2 m^2)^{1/2}$. This is related to the time component of the 4-momentum by $P_0 = -\epsilon$ in the synchronous gauge and $P_0 = -(1+\psi)\epsilon$ in the conformal Newtonian gauge. For the CDM+HDM model we are interested in, the photons, the massless neutrinos, and the 7 eV neutrinos at the time of neutrino decoupling are all ultra-relativistic particles, so ϵ in the unperturbed Fermi-Dirac and Bose-Einstein distributions can be simply replaced by the new variable q.

The general expression for the energy-momentum tensor written in terms of the distribution function and the 4-momentum components is given by

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \int dP_1 dP_2 dP_3 \, (-g)^{-1/2} \, \frac{P_\mu P_\nu}{P^0} f(x^i, P_j, \tau) \, , \tag{33}$$

where g denotes the determinant of $g_{\mu\nu}$. It is convenient to write the phase space distribution as a zeroth-order distribution plus a perturbed piece in the new variables q and n_j:

$$f(x^i, P_j, \tau) = f_0(q) \left[1 + \Psi(x^i, q, n_j, \tau) \right] . \tag{34}$$

In the synchronous gauge, we have $(-g)^{-1/2} = a^{-4}(1 - \frac{1}{2}h)$ and $dP_1 dP_2 dP_3 = (1 + \frac{3}{2} h_{ij} n_i n_j) q^2 dq d\Omega$ to linear order, where $h \equiv h_{ii}$ and $d\Omega$ is the solid angle associated with direction n_i. Using the relations $\int d\Omega \, n_i n_j = 4\pi \delta_{ij}/3$ and $\int d\Omega \, n_i = \int d\Omega \, n_i n_j n_k = 0$, it then follows from equation (33) that

$$\begin{aligned}
T^0{}_0 &= -a^{-4} \int q^2 dq \, d\Omega \, \sqrt{q^2 + m^2 a^2} \, f_0(q) \, (1 + \Psi) \, , \\
T^0{}_i &= a^{-4} \int q^2 dq \, d\Omega \, q \, n_i \, f_0(q) \, \Psi \, , \\
T^i{}_j &= a^{-4} \int q^2 dq d\Omega \, \frac{q^2 n_i n_j}{\sqrt{q^2 + m^2 a^2}} \, f_0(q) \, (1 + \Psi)
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

to linear order in the perturbations. Note that we have eliminated the explicit dependence on the metric perturbations in equation (33) by redefining P_i in terms of q and n_i. Note also that the comoving energy $\epsilon(q, \tau) = (q^2 + a^2 m^2)^{1/2}$ is used in the integrands but not in the argument of the unperturbed distribution function.

In the conformal Newtonian gauge, $(-g)^{-1/2} = a^{-4}(1 - \psi + 3\phi)$ and $dP_1 dP_2 dP_3 = (1 - 3\phi) q^2 dq d\Omega$. It then follows that the components of the energy-momentum tensor have the same form as in equations (35). Of course, it is understood that the variables q and n_i in this case

are defined in relation to the conjugate momentum P_i in the conformal Newtonian coordinates, and not the synchronous coordinates. (They differ because comoving observers in the two coordinate systems are not the same.) The expansion factor a and Ψ are evaluated at the coordinates (x^i, τ) in the conformal Newtonian gauge.

The phase space distribution evolves according to the Boltzmann equation. In terms of our variables (x^i, q, n_j, τ) this is

$$\frac{Df}{d\tau} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau} + \frac{dx^i}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} + \frac{dq}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} + \frac{dn_i}{d\tau}\frac{\partial f}{\partial n_i} = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau}\right)_C , \tag{36}$$

where the right-hand side involves terms due to collisions, whose form depends on the type of particle interactions involved. From the geodesic equation

$$P^0 \frac{dP^\mu}{d\tau} + \Gamma^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta}\, P^\alpha P^\beta = 0 , \tag{37}$$

it is straightforward to show that

$$\begin{aligned} dq/d\tau &= -\frac{1}{2} q \dot{h}_{ij} n_i n_j \qquad \text{in synchronous gauge} , \\ dq/d\tau &= q\dot{\phi} - \epsilon(q,\tau)\, n_i \partial_i \psi \qquad \text{in conformal Newtonian gauge} , \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

and $dn_i/d\tau$ is $O(h)$. Since $\partial f/\partial n_i$ is also a first-order quantity, the term $(dn_i/d\tau)(\partial f/\partial n_i)$ in the Boltzmann equation can be neglected to first order. Then the Boltzmann equation in k-space can be written as

Synchronous gauge —

$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \tau} + i\,\frac{q}{\epsilon}(\vec{k}\cdot\hat{n})\Psi + \frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\left[\dot{\eta} - \frac{\dot{h}+6\dot{\eta}}{2}(\hat{k}\cdot\hat{n})^2\right] = \frac{1}{f_0}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau}\right)_C , \tag{39}$$

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \tau} + i\,\frac{q}{\epsilon}\,(\vec{k}\cdot\hat{n})\,\Psi + \frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\left[\dot{\phi} - i\,\frac{\epsilon}{q}(\vec{k}\cdot\hat{n})\,\psi\right] = \frac{1}{f_0}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau}\right)_C . \tag{40}$$

Equations (39) and (40) can also be derived using the canonical phase space variables x^i and P_j and Hamilton's equations (instead of the geodesic equation), followed by a transformation from P_j to qn_j.

The terms in the Boltzmann equation depend on the direction of the momentum $\hat{n}$ only through its angle with $\vec{k}$. (We shall see that this is true of the collision term for photons as well as the convective and metric perturbation terms.) Therefore, if the momentum-dependence of the initial phase space perturbation is axially symmetric about $\vec{k}$, it will remain axially symmetric. If axially-asymmetric perturbations in the neutrinos or other collisionless particles are produced, they would generate no scalar metric perturbations and thus would have no effect on other species.

Therefore, we shall assume that the initial momentum-dependence is axially symmetric so that Ψ depends on $\vec{q} = q\hat{n}$ only through q and $\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}$. This assumption, which effectively reduces the dimensionality of phase space perturbations by one (after Fourier transforming on the spatial coordinates), has been made (implicitly, if not explicitly) in all previous studies of the evolution of scalar perturbations.

5.2. Cold Dark Matter

CDM interacts with other particles only through gravity and can be treated as a pressureless perfect fluid. The CDM particles can be used to define the synchronous coordinates and therefore have zero peculiar velocities in this gauge. Setting $\theta = \Theta = 0$ and $w = \dot{w} = c_s^2 = 0$ in equations (28) leads to

Synchronous gauge —

$$\dot{\delta_c} = -\frac{1}{2}\,\dot{h}\,. \tag{41}$$

The CDM fluid velocity in the conformal Newtonian gauge, however, is not zero in general. In k-space, equations (29) give

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$\dot{\delta_c} = -\theta_c + 3\dot{\phi}\,, \quad \dot{\theta}_c = -\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\,\theta_c + k^2\psi\,. \tag{42}$$

The subscript c in δ_c and θ_c denotes the cold dark matter.

5.3. Massless Neutrinos

The energy density and the pressure for massless neutrinos (labeled by subscripts ν) are $\rho_\nu = 3P_\nu = -T^0{}_0 = T^i_i$. From equations (35) the unperturbed energy density $\bar{\rho}_\nu$ and pressure $\bar{P}_\nu$ are given by

$$\bar{\rho}_\nu = 3\bar{P}_\nu = a^{-4}\int q^2 dq d\Omega\, q f_0(q)\,, \tag{43}$$

and the perturbations of energy density $\delta\rho_\nu$, pressure δP_ν, energy flux $\delta T^0_{\nu\,i}$, and shear stress $\Sigma^i_{\nu\,j} = T^i_{\nu\,j} - P_\nu\delta_{ij}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\rho_\nu &= 3\delta P_\nu = a^{-4}\int q^2 dq d\Omega\, q f_0(q)\Psi\,,\\
\delta T^0_{\nu\,i} &= a^{-4}\int q^2 dq d\Omega\, q n_i\, f_0(q)\Psi\,,\\
\Sigma^i_{\nu\,j} &= a^{-4}\int q^2 dq d\Omega\, q(n_i n_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij})\, f_0(q)\Psi\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

The unperturbed energy flux and shear stress are zero.

The Boltzmann equation simplifies for massless particles, for which $\epsilon = q$. To reduce the number of variables we integrate out the q-dependence in the neutrino distribution function and expand the angular dependence of the perturbation in a series of Legendre polynomials $P_l(\hat{k}\cdot\hat{n})$:

$$F_\nu(\vec{k},\hat{n},\tau) \equiv \frac{\int q^2 dq\, q f_0(q)\Psi}{\int q^2 dq\, q f_0(q)} \equiv \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}(-i)^l F_{\nu\,l}(\vec{k},\tau)P_l(\hat{k}\cdot\hat{n})\,. \tag{45}$$

As noted in §5.1, the dependence on $\vec{n}$ arises only through $\hat{k}\cdot\hat{n}$, so that a general distribution may be represented as in equation (45).

In terms of the new variable $F_\nu(\vec{k},\vec{n},\tau)$ and its harmonic expansion coefficients, the perturbations δ_ν, $\bar{\rho}_\nu$, θ_ν, and Θ_ν (defined in eq. 21) take the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\nu &= \frac{1}{4\pi}\int d\Omega F_\nu(\vec{k},\hat{n},\tau) = F_{\nu\,0}\,,\\
\theta_\nu &= \frac{3i}{16\pi}\int d\Omega\,(\vec{k}\cdot\hat{n})F_\nu(\vec{k},\hat{n},\tau) = \frac{1}{4}kF_{\nu\,1}\,,\\
\Theta_\nu &= -\frac{3}{16\pi}\int d\Omega\left[(\hat{k}\cdot\hat{n})^2-\frac{1}{3}\right]F_\nu(\vec{k},\hat{n},\tau) = \frac{1}{10}F_{\nu\,2}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where we have used $\rho_\nu = 3P_\nu$ for the massless neutrinos.

Integrating equations (39) and (40) over $q^2dq\,qf_0(q)$ and dividing them by $\int q^2dq\,qf_0(q)$, the Boltzmann equation for massless neutrinos becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial F_\nu}{\partial\tau} + ik\mu F_\nu &= -\frac{2}{3}\dot{h} - \frac{4}{3}(\dot{h}+6\dot{\eta})P_2(\mu) \qquad \text{in synchronous gauge}\,,\\
\frac{\partial F_\nu}{\partial\tau} + ik\mu F_\nu &= 4\,(\dot{\phi} - ik\mu\psi) \qquad \text{in conformal Newtonian gauge}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where $\mu \equiv \hat{k}\cdot\hat{n}$ and $P_2(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}(3\mu^2-1)$ is the Legendre polynomial of degree 2. Substituting the Legendre expansion for F_ν and using the orthonormality of the Legendre polynomials and the recursion relation $(l+1)P_{l+1}(\mu) = (2l+1)\mu P_l(\mu) - lP_{l-1}(\mu)$, we obtain

Synchronous gauge —

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\delta}_\nu &= -\frac{4}{3}\theta_\nu - \frac{2}{3}\dot{h}\,,\\
\dot{\theta}_\nu &= k^2\left(\frac{1}{4}\delta_\nu - \Theta_\nu\right),\\
\dot{F}_{\nu\,2} &= 10\dot{\Theta}_\nu = \frac{8}{3}\theta_\nu - \frac{3}{7}kF_{\nu\,3} + \frac{4}{3}\dot{h} + 8\dot{\eta}\,,\\
\dot{F}_{\nu\,l} &= k\left[\frac{l}{2l-1}F_{\nu\,(l-1)} - \frac{l+1}{2l+3}F_{\nu\,(l+1)}\right], \quad l\geq 3\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\delta}_\nu &= -\frac{4}{3}\theta_\nu + 4\dot{\phi}\,, \\
\dot{\theta}_\nu &= k^2\left(\frac{1}{4}\delta_\nu - \Theta_\nu\right) + k^2\psi\,, \\
\dot{F}_{\nu\,l} &= k\left[\frac{l}{2l-1}F_{\nu\,(l-1)} - \frac{l+1}{2l+3}F_{\nu\,(l+1)}\right], \quad l \geq 2\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

This set of equations governs the evolution of the phase space distribution of massless neutrinos. Note that a given mode F_l is coupled only to the $(l-1)$ and $(l+1)$ neighboring modes.

5.4. Massive Neutrinos

Massive neutrinos also obey the collisionless Boltzmann equation. The evolution of the distribution function for massive neutrinos is, however, complicated by their nonzero mass. From equations (35), the unperturbed energy density and pressure for massive neutrinos (labeled by subscripts "h" for HDM) are given by

$$\bar{\rho}_h = a^{-4}\int q^2 dq\, d\Omega\, \epsilon f_0(q)\,, \qquad \bar{P}_h = \frac{1}{3}a^{-4}\int q^2 dq\, d\Omega\, \frac{q^2}{\epsilon} f_0(q)\,, \tag{50}$$

where $\epsilon = \epsilon(q,\tau) = \sqrt{q^2 + m_\nu^2 a^2}$, while the perturbations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\rho_h &= a^{-4}\textstyle\int q^2 dq\, d\Omega\, \epsilon f_0(q)\Psi\,, & \delta P_h &= \frac{1}{3}a^{-4}\int q^2 dq\, d\Omega\, \frac{q^2}{\epsilon} f_0(q)\Psi\,, \\
\delta T^0_{h\,i} &= a^{-4}\textstyle\int q^2 dq\, d\Omega\, q n_i\, f_0(q)\Psi\,, & \Sigma^i_{h\,j} &= a^{-4}\int q^2 dq\, d\Omega\, \frac{q^2}{\epsilon}(n_i n_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij})\, f_0(q)\Psi\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Since the comoving energy-momentum relation $\epsilon(q,\tau)$ depends on both the momentum and time, we can not simplify the calculations by integrating out the q-dependence in the distribution function as we did for the massless neutrinos above (see eq. 45). Instead of applying equation (45), we expand the perturbation Ψ directly in a Legendre series

$$\Psi(\vec{k},\hat{n},q,\tau) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty}(-i)^l \Psi_l(\vec{k},q,\tau) P_l(\hat{k}\cdot\hat{n})\,. \tag{52}$$

Then the perturbed energy density, pressure, energy flux, and shear stress in k-space are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\rho_h &= 4\pi a^{-4}\int q^2 dq\, \epsilon f_0(q)\Psi_0\,, \\
\delta P_h &= \frac{4\pi}{3}a^{-4}\int q^2 dq\, \frac{q^2}{\epsilon} f_0(q)\Psi_0\,, \\
(\bar{\rho}_h + \bar{P}_h)\theta_h &= \frac{4\pi}{3}k a^{-4}\int q^2 dq\, q f_0(q)\Psi_1\,, \\
(\bar{\rho}_h + \bar{P}_h)\Theta_h &= \frac{8\pi}{15}a^{-4}\int q^2 dq\, \frac{q^2}{\epsilon} f_0(q)\Psi_2\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Following the same procedure used for the massless neutrinos, the Boltzmann equation becomes

Synchronous gauge —

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\Psi}_0 &= -\frac{qk}{3\epsilon}\Psi_1 + \frac{1}{6}\dot{h}\frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\,, \\
\dot{\Psi}_1 &= \frac{qk}{\epsilon}\left(\Psi_0 - \frac{2}{5}\Psi_2\right), \\
\dot{\Psi}_2 &= \frac{qk}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{2}{3}\Psi_1 - \frac{3}{7}\Psi_3\right) - \left(\frac{1}{3}\dot{h} + 2\dot{\eta}\right)\frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\,, \\
\dot{\Psi}_l &= \frac{qk}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{l}{2l-1}\Psi_{l-1} - \frac{l+1}{2l+3}\Psi_{l+1}\right), \quad l \geq 3\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\Psi}_0 &= -\frac{qk}{3\epsilon}\Psi_1 - \dot{\phi}\frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\,, \\
\dot{\Psi}_1 &= \frac{qk}{\epsilon}\left(\Psi_0 - \frac{2}{5}\Psi_2\right) - \frac{\epsilon\, k}{q}\psi\frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\,, \\
\dot{\Psi}_l &= \frac{qk}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{l}{2l-1}\Psi_{l-1} - \frac{l+1}{2l+3}\Psi_{l+1}\right), \quad l \geq 2\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Because of the q-dependence in these equations, it requires much more computing time to carry out the time integration for the massive neutrino. Bond & Szalay (1983) used a 16-point Gauss-Legendre method to approximate the q-integration. We do not use this method and instead perform the integration using cubic splines (plus a remainder obtained by asymptotic expansion) with a q-grid of 100 q-points for every wavenumber k. We verified that this was enough to ensure a relative accuracy no worse than 10^{-6} by trying the integration with 200 points. Then the perturbations $\delta\rho_h$, δP_h, θ_h, and Θ_h that enter the right-hand side of the Einstein equations are calculated from equations (53) by numerically integrating Ψ_0, Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 over q.

5.5. Photons

Photons evolve differently before and after recombination. Before recombination, photons and baryons are tightly coupled, interacting mainly via Thomson scattering (and the electrostatic coupling of electrons and ions). In Thomson scatterings, the photon energy $h\nu$ is assumed to be much less than the electron rest mass $m_e \sim 0.511$ MeV and the recoil of the electron in the initial electron rest frame is neglected. (We are concerned with the period after neutrino decoupling, when $T < m_e$.) The classical differential cross section for Thomson scattering is given by $d\sigma_T/d\Omega = 3\sigma_T(1+\cos^2\theta)/16\pi$, where $\sigma_T = 0.6652 \times 10^{-24}$ cm^2 and θ is the scattering angle

(e.g., Jackson 1975). After recombination, the universe gradually becomes transparent to radiation and photons travel almost freely, although Thomson scattering continues to transfer energy and momentum between the photons and the matter.

The evolution of the photon distribution function can be treated in a similar way as the massless neutrinos, with the exception that the collisional terms on the right-hand side of the Boltzmann equation are now present. We shall denote by $F_\gamma(\vec{k},\hat{n},\tau)$ the momentum-averaged phase space density perturbation, defined as in equation (45). The linearized collision operator for Thomson scattering is (Wilson & Silk 1980; Dodelson & Jubas 1993)

$$\left(\frac{\partial F_\gamma}{\partial\tau}\right)_C = an_e\sigma_T\left[-F_\gamma(\vec{k},\hat{n},\tau) + F_{\gamma\,0}(\vec{k},\tau) + 4\hat{n}\cdot\vec{v}_e - \frac{1}{10}F_{\gamma\,2}P_2(\hat{k}\cdot\hat{n})\right], \tag{56}$$

where n_e and $\vec{v}_e$ are the proper mean density and velocity of the electrons. The term proportional to P_2 comes from the angular dependence $\cos^2\theta$ in the Thomson cross section above. The P_2 term was neglected by Peebles & Yu (1970), but was included by Wilson & Silk (1980, 1981). Expanding $F_\gamma(\vec{k},\hat{n},\tau)$ in Legendre series as in equation (45) and using the relations $\hat{n}\cdot\vec{v}_e = i\theta_b P_1(\hat{k}\cdot\hat{n})$, $F_{\gamma\,1} = k\theta_\gamma/4$, and $F_{\gamma\,2} = 10\Theta_\gamma$, the collision operator can be rewritten as

$$\left(\frac{\partial F_\gamma}{\partial\tau}\right)_C = an_e\sigma_T\left[\frac{4i}{k}(\theta_\gamma-\theta_b)P_1 + 9\Theta_\gamma P_2 - \sum_{l\geq 3}^{\infty}(-i)^l F_{\gamma\,l}P_l\right]. \tag{57}$$

The left-hand-side of the Boltzmann equation remains the same as for the massless neutrinos, so we obtain

Synchronous gauge —

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\delta}_\gamma &= -\frac{4}{3}\theta_\gamma - \frac{2}{3}\dot{h}\,,\\
\dot{\theta}_\gamma &= k^2\left(\frac{1}{4}\delta_\gamma - \Theta_\gamma\right) + an_e\sigma_T(\theta_b-\theta_\gamma)\,,\\
\dot{F}_{\gamma\,2} &= 10\dot{\Theta}_\gamma = \frac{8}{3}\theta_\gamma - \frac{3}{7}kF_{\gamma\,3} + \frac{4}{3}\dot{h} + 8\dot{\eta} - 9an_e\sigma_T\Theta_\gamma\,,\\
\dot{F}_{\gamma\,l} &= k\left[\frac{l}{2l-1}F_{\gamma\,(l-1)} - \frac{l+1}{2l+3}F_{\gamma\,(l+1)}\right] - an_e\sigma_T F_{\gamma\,l}\,, \quad l\geq 3\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\delta}_\gamma &= -\frac{4}{3}\theta_\gamma + 4\dot{\phi}\,,\\
\dot{\theta}_\gamma &= k^2\left(\frac{1}{4}\delta_\gamma - \Theta_\gamma\right) + k^2\psi + an_e\sigma_T(\theta_b-\theta_\gamma)\,,\\
\dot{F}_{\gamma\,2} &= 10\dot{\Theta}_\gamma = \frac{8}{3}\theta_\gamma - \frac{3}{7}kF_{\gamma\,3} - 9an_e\sigma_T\Theta_\gamma\,,\\
\dot{F}_{\gamma\,l} &= k\left[\frac{l}{2l-1}F_{\gamma\,(l-1)} - \frac{l+1}{2l+3}F_{\gamma\,(l+1)}\right] - an_e\sigma_T F_{\gamma\,l}\,, \quad l\geq 3\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

The subscripts γ and b refer to photons and baryons respectively.

5.6. Baryons

The baryons (and electrons) behave like a non-relativistic fluid described, in the absence of coupling to radiation, by the energy-momentum conservation equations (28) and (29) with $\delta P/\delta\rho = c_s^2 = w \ll 1$ and $\Theta = 0$. Since the baryons are very nonrelativistic after neutrino decoupling (the period of interest), we may neglect w and $\delta P/\delta\rho$ in all terms except the acoustic term $c_s^2 k^2 \delta$ (which is important for sufficiently high k; note that the shear stress term $k^2\Theta$ is far smaller so we neglect it). Before recombination, however, the coupling of the baryons and the photons causes a transfer of momentum (and energy) between the two components.

From equation (21) the momentum density $T^0{}_j$ for a given species is related to θ by $ik^j \delta T^0{}_j = (\bar\rho + \bar P)\theta$. The momentum transfer into the photon component is represented by $an_e\sigma_T(\theta_b - \theta_\gamma)$ of equations (58) and (59). Momentum conservation in Thomson scattering then implies that a term $(4\bar\rho_\gamma/3\bar\rho_b)\, an_e\sigma_T(\theta_\gamma - \theta_b)$ has to be added to the equation for $\dot\theta_b$ (where we have used $\bar P_b \ll \bar\rho_b$), so equations (28) and (29) are modified to become

Synchronous gauge —

$$\begin{aligned} \dot\delta_b &= -\theta_b - \frac{1}{2}\dot h\,, \\ \dot\theta_b &= -\frac{\dot a}{a}\theta_b + c_s^2 k^2 \delta_b + \frac{4\bar\rho_\gamma}{3\bar\rho_b} an_e\sigma_T(\theta_\gamma - \theta_b)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$\begin{aligned} \dot\delta_b &= -\theta_b + 3\dot\phi\,, \\ \dot\theta_b &= -\frac{\dot a}{a}\theta_b + c_s^2 k^2 \delta_b + \frac{4\bar\rho_\gamma}{3\bar\rho_b} an_e\sigma_T(\theta_\gamma - \theta_b) + k^2\psi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

5.7. Tight-Coupling Approximation

Before recombination the Thomson opacity is so large that photons and baryons are tightly coupled, with $an_e\sigma_T \equiv \tau_c^{-1} \gg \dot a/a \sim \tau^{-1}$. The large size of the Thomson drag terms in the equations for $\dot\theta_\gamma$ and $\dot\theta_b$ of equations (58)–(61) make these equations numerically difficult to solve. Therefore, in this limit we shall follow the method of Peebles & Yu (1970) to obtain an alternative form of the equations valid for $\tau_c/\tau \ll 1$ and $k\tau_c \ll 1$. The starting point is the exact equation obtained by combining the second of equations (59) and (61),

$$(1+R)\dot\theta_b + \frac{\dot a}{a}\theta_b - c_s^2 k^2 \delta_b - k^2 R\left(\frac{1}{4}\delta_\gamma - \Theta_\gamma\right) + R(\dot\theta_\gamma - \dot\theta_b) = (1+R)k^2\psi\ , \tag{62}$$

where the right-hand side is included only in the conformal Newtonian gauge; in the synchronous gauge it is set to zero. We have defined $R \equiv (4/3)\bar{\rho}_\gamma/\bar{\rho}_b$. We shall see that the terms proportional to $(\dot{\theta}_\gamma - \dot{\theta}_b)$ and Θ_γ may be neglected to lowest order in $\max[k\tau_c, \tau_c/\tau]$, with the result that the baryons and photons behave like a single coupled fluid with velocity $\vec{v}_b$. However, we require a more accurate approximation to account for the slip between the photon and baryon fluids.

From the second of equations (59), we have

$$\theta_b - \theta_\gamma = \tau_c \left[\dot{\theta}_\gamma - k^2 \left(\frac{1}{4}\delta_\gamma - \Theta_\gamma \right) - k^2\psi \right] \tag{63}$$

in the conformal Newtonian gauge; in the synchronous gauge we simply set $\psi = 0$. Writing $\dot{\theta}_\gamma$ as $\dot{\theta}_b + (\dot{\theta}_\gamma - \dot{\theta}_b)$ and using equation (62), we get

$$\theta_b - \theta_\gamma = \frac{\tau_c}{1+R} \left[-\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\theta_b + k^2 \left(c_s^2\delta_b - \frac{1}{4}\delta_\gamma + \Theta_\gamma \right) + \dot{\theta}_\gamma - \dot{\theta}_b \right] , \tag{64}$$

a result that is valid in both gauges. From the third of equations (58), we have

$$\Theta_\gamma = \frac{\tau_c}{9} \left(\frac{8}{3}\theta_\gamma + \frac{4}{3}\dot{h} + 8\dot{\eta} - 10\dot{\Theta}_\gamma - \frac{3}{7}kF_{\gamma\,3} \right) \tag{65}$$

in the synchronous gauge; in the conformal Newtonian gauge one sets $\dot{h} = \dot{\eta} = 0$. We see that $\Theta_\gamma \sim \delta_\gamma \times \max[k\tau_c, \tau_c/\tau]$ (the case $k\tau_c$ corresponding to acoustic oscillations with $\theta_\gamma \sim k\delta_\gamma$). Higher moments of the photon distribution are smaller by additional powers of $k\tau_c$ and we shall neglect them in the limit of tight coupling considered here. Our goal is to obtain equations for $\dot{\theta}_b$ and $\dot{\theta}_\gamma$ that are accurate to second order in τ_c.

To get an equation for $\dot{\theta}_b$ we differentiate equation (64) and use equation (62). Assuming that the gas is nearly fully ionized so that $n_e \propto a^{-3}$ and that the baryon temperature is approximately the radiation temperature implying $c_s^2 \propto a^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\dot{\theta}_b - \dot{\theta}_\gamma = \frac{2R}{1+R}\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\theta_b - \theta_\gamma) + \frac{\tau_c}{1+R} \left[-\frac{\ddot{a}}{a}\theta_b - \frac{\dot{a}}{a}k^2 \left(\frac{1}{2}\delta_\gamma + \psi \right) + k^2 \left(c_s^2\dot{\delta}_b - \frac{1}{4}\dot{\delta}_\gamma \right) \right] + O(\tau_c^2). \tag{66}$$

This equation holds in the conformal Newtonian gauge; in the synchronous gauge one should set $\psi = 0$. Note that $\dot{\delta}_b$ and $\dot{\delta}_\gamma$ are to be evaluated using the first of equations (58)–(61). Substituting equation (66) into equation (62) yields our desired equation of motion for $\max[k\tau_c, \tau_c/\tau] \ll 1$. If this condition is violated, then one should use the explicit form of equations (60) and (61) for $\dot{\theta}_b$.

To obtain an equation for $\dot{\theta}_\gamma$ we combine the explicit equations for $\dot{\theta}_\gamma$ and $\dot{\theta}_b$ to obtain the exact equation

$$\dot{\theta}_\gamma = -R^{-1} \left(\dot{\theta}_b + \frac{\dot{a}}{a}\theta_b - c_s^2k^2\delta_b \right) + k^2 \left(\frac{1}{4}\delta_\gamma - \Theta_\gamma \right) + \frac{(1+R)}{R}k^2\psi \tag{67}$$

in conformal Newtonian gauge; in synchronous gauge one sets $\psi = 0$. For $\dot{\theta}_b$ we use the tight-coupling approximation (substituting eq. 66 into eq. 62) at early times and the exact explicit

equations (60) or (61) at late times. In practice, we switch to the explicit scheme for $\dot{\theta}_b$ when $T_b = 2 \times 10^4$ K; we switch to the explicit scheme for $\dot{F}_{\gamma\, l}$ for $l > 1$ and $T_b = 2 \times 10^5$ K (at earlier times these moments are set to zero). We have verified that these switches occur early enough to preserve good accuracy in the resulting photon phase space distribution.

5.8. Recombination

In order to compute the Thomson scattering terms in the equations of motion for photons and baryons we need to know the free electron density $n_e(\tau)$. Our treatment is based on Peebles (1968; see also Peebles 1993). We summarize the procedure here.

Because the Thomson opacity is enormous until hydrogen begins to recombine, it is sufficient to treat the helium as being fully neutral at all times. We define the ionization fraction of hydrogen as $x_e = n_e/n_H$ where n_H is the number density of hydrogen nuclei. The ionization rate equation is (Peebles 1968; Spitzer 1978)

$$\frac{dx_e}{d\tau} = aC_r \left[\beta(T_b)(1 - x_e) - n_H \alpha^{(2)}(T_b) x_e^2\right] \ . \tag{68}$$

The factor C_r is discussed below. The collisional ionization rate from the ground state is

$$\beta(T_b) = \left(\frac{m_e k_{\rm B} T_b}{2\pi\hbar^2}\right)^{3/2} e^{-B_1/k_{\rm B}T_b}\, \alpha^{(2)}(T_b) \ , \tag{69}$$

where $B_1 = m_e e^4/(2\hbar^2) = 13.6$ eV is the ground state binding energy, and the recombination rate to excited states is

$$\alpha^{(2)}(T_b) = \frac{64\pi}{(27\pi)^{1/2}} \frac{e^4}{m_e^2 c^3} \left(\frac{k_{\rm B} T_b}{B_1}\right)^{-1/2} \phi_2(T_b) \ , \quad \phi_2(T_b) \approx 0.448 \, \ln\left(\frac{B_1}{k_{\rm B} T_b}\right) \ . \tag{70}$$

This expression for $\phi_2(T_b)$ is a good approximation (better than one percent for $T_b < 6000$ K). At high temperatures this expression underestimates ϕ_2 but the neutral fraction is negligible so that we make no significant error by setting $\phi_2 = 0$ for $T_b > B_1/k_{\rm B} = 1.58 \times 10^5$ K.

Recombination directly to the ground state is inhibited by the large Lyman alpha and Lyman continuum opacities. Net recombination must occur either by 2-photon decay from the $2s$ level, with a rate $\Lambda_{2s\to 1s} = 8.227\ {\rm s}^{-1}$, or by the cosmological redshifting of Lyman alpha photons away from the line center. Peebles (1968) gives a detailed discussion of these atomic processes. The net recombination rate to the ground state is reduced by the fact that an atom in the $n = 2$ level may be ionized before it decays to the ground state. The reduction factor C_r is just the ratio of the net decay rate (including 2-photon decay and Lyman alpha production at the rate allowed by redshifting of photons out of the line) to the sum of the decay and ionization rates from the $n = 2$ level:

$$C_r = \frac{\Lambda_\alpha + \Lambda_{2s\to 1s}}{\Lambda_\alpha + \Lambda_{2s\to 1s} + \beta^{(2)}(T_b)} \ , \tag{71}$$

where

$$\beta^{(2)}(T_b) = \beta(T_b) e^{+h\nu_\alpha/k_{\rm B}T_b} \ , \quad \Lambda_\alpha = \frac{8\pi\dot{a}}{a^2\lambda_\alpha^3 n_{1s}} \ , \quad \lambda_\alpha = \frac{8\pi\hbar c}{3B_1} = 1.216\times10^{-5}\ {\rm cm} \ , \tag{72}$$

where $\nu_\alpha = c/\lambda_\alpha$. For $T_b \ll 10^5$ K, it is a very good approximation to replace the number density n_{1s} of hydrogen atoms in the $1s$ state by $(1-x_e)n_H$.

We integrate equation (68) using a stable and accurate semi-implicit method with a large number of timesteps through recombination. Since the results are independent of the perturbations, we pre-compute the ionization history of a model and later use cubic splines interpolation to obtain $x_e(\tau)$ accurately during integration of the perturbation equations.

6. Super-Horizon-Sized Perturbations and Initial Conditions

The evolution equations derived in the previous sections can be solved numerically once the initial perturbations are specified. We start the integration at early times when a given k-mode is still outside the horizon, i.e., $k\tau \ll 1$ where $k\tau$ is dimensionless. (We follow common usage in referring to waves with $k\tau < 1$ as being "outside the horizon" even though τ is more appropriately called the comoving Hubble distance.) The behavior of the density fluctuations on scales larger than the horizon is gauge-dependent. The fluctuations can appear as growing modes in one coordinate system and as constant modes in another. As we will show in this section, this is exactly what occurs in the synchronous and the conformal Newtonian gauges.

We first review the synchronous gauge behavior, which has already been discussed by Press & Vishniac (1980) and Wilson & Silk (1981), although these authors did not include neutrinos. We are concerned only with the radiation-dominated era since the numerical integration for all the k-modes of interest will start in this era. At this early time, the massive neutrinos are relativistic, and the CDM and the baryons make a negligible contribution to the total energy density of the universe: $\bar{\rho}_{\rm total} = \bar{\rho}_\nu + \bar{\rho}_\gamma$. The expansion rate is $\dot{a}/a = \tau^{-1}$. We can analytically extract the time-dependence of the metric and density perturbations h, η, δ, and θ on super-horizon scales ($k\tau \ll 1$) from equations (20), (48) and (58). The large Thomson damping terms in equations (58) drive the $l \geq 2$ moments of the photon distribution function $F_{\gamma l}$ to zero. Similarly, $F_{\nu l}$ for $l \geq 3$ can be ignored because they are smaller than $F_{\nu 2}$ by successive powers of $k\tau$. Equations (20a), (20c), (48), and (58) then give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau^2\ddot{h} + \tau\dot{h} + 6[(1-R_\nu)\delta_\gamma + R_\nu\delta_\nu] = 0\,, \\
&\dot{\delta}_\gamma + \frac{4}{3}\theta_\gamma + \frac{2}{3}\dot{h} = 0\,, \qquad \dot{\theta}_\gamma - \frac{1}{4}k^2\delta_\gamma = 0\,, \\
&\dot{\delta}_\nu + \frac{4}{3}\theta_\nu + \frac{2}{3}\dot{h} = 0\,, \qquad \dot{\theta}_\nu - \frac{1}{4}k^2(\delta_\nu - 4\Theta_\nu) = 0\,, \\
&\dot{\Theta}_\nu - \frac{2}{15}(2\theta_\nu + \dot{h} + 6\dot{\eta}) = 0\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where we have defined $R_\nu \equiv \bar{\rho}_\nu/(\bar{\rho}_\gamma + \bar{\rho}_\nu)$. For N_ν flavors of neutrinos ($N_\nu = 3$ in the standard model), after electron-positron pair annihilation and before the massive neutrinos become nonrelativistic, $\bar{\rho}_\nu/\bar{\rho}_\gamma = (7N_\nu/8)(4/11)^{4/3}$ is a constant.

To lowest order in $k\tau$, the terms $\propto k^2$ in equations (73) can be dropped, and we have $\dot{\theta}_\nu = \dot{\theta}_\gamma = 0$. Then these equations can be combined into a single fourth-order equation for h:

$$\tau \frac{d^4 h}{d\tau^4} + 5\frac{d^3 h}{d\tau^3} = 0\,, \tag{74}$$

whose four solutions are power laws: $h \propto \tau^n$ with $n = 0$, 1, 2, and -2. From equations (73) we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h &= A + B(k\tau)^{-2} + C(k\tau)^2 + D(k\tau)\,, \\ \delta \equiv (1-R_\nu)\delta_\gamma + R_\nu\delta_\nu &= -\frac{2}{3}B(k\tau)^{-2} - \frac{2}{3}C(k\tau)^2 - \frac{1}{6}D(k\tau)\,, \\ \theta \equiv (1-R_\nu)\theta_\gamma + R_\nu\theta_\nu &= -\frac{3}{8}Dk\,, \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

and A, B, C, and D are arbitrary dimensionless constants. The other metric perturbation η can be found from equation (20a):

$$\eta = 2C + \frac{3}{4}D(k\tau)^{-1}\,. \tag{76}$$

Press & Vishniac (1980) derived a general expression for the time dependence of the four eigenmodes. They showed that of these four modes, the first two (proportional to A and B) are gauge modes that can be eliminated by a suitable coordinate transformation. The latter two modes (proportional to C and D) correspond to physical modes of density perturbations on scales larger than the Hubble distance in the radiation-dominated era. Both physical modes appear as growing modes in the synchronous gauge, but the $C(k\tau)^2$ mode dominates at later times. In fact, the mode proportional to D in the radiation-dominated era decays in the matter-dominated era (Ratra 1988). We choose our initial conditions so that only the fastest-growing physical mode is present (this is appropriate for perturbations created in the early universe), in which case $\theta_\gamma = \theta_\nu = \dot{\eta} = 0$ to lowest order in $k\tau$. To get nonzero starting values we must use the full equations (73) to obtain higher order terms for these variables. To get the perturbations in the baryons we impose the condition of constant entropy per baryon. Using all of these inputs, we obtain the leading-order behavior of super-horizon-sized perturbations in the synchronous gauge:

Synchronous gauge —

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_\gamma = -\frac{2}{3}C(k\tau)^2\,, \qquad \delta_c = \delta_b = \frac{3}{4}\delta_\nu = \frac{3}{4}\delta_\gamma\,, \\ &\theta_c = 0\,, \quad \theta_\gamma = \theta_b = -\frac{1}{18}C(k^4\tau^3)\,, \quad \theta_\nu = \frac{23+4R_\nu}{15+4R_\nu}\theta_\gamma\,, \\ &\Theta_\nu = \frac{4C}{3(15+4R_\nu)}(k\tau)^2\,, \\ &h = C(k\tau)^2\,, \qquad \eta = 2C - \frac{5+4R_\nu}{6(15+4R_\nu)}C(k\tau)^2\,. \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

The initial conditions for the moments $\Psi_l, l \geq 1$, of the massive neutrino distribution can be related to Ψ_0 and the variables above by equations (54). To obtain the initial Ψ_0, we can write the perturbed distribution function as $f = f_0(q)(1 + \Psi_0) = 2h_{\rm P}^{-3}\{\exp[q/k(T + \delta T)] + 1\}^{-1}$, where $\delta T/T = \delta_\nu/4$ by the isentropic condition. Then using equations (54), we find the first three moments to be

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0 &= -\frac{1}{4}\delta_\nu \frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\,, \\ \Psi_1 &= -\frac{\epsilon}{qk}\theta_\nu \frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\,, \\ \Psi_2 &= \frac{5}{2}\left[\frac{m_\nu^2 a^2}{4q^2}\delta_\nu - \frac{\epsilon^2}{q^2}\Theta_\nu\right]\frac{d\ln f_0}{d\ln q}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

The higher moments Ψ_l ($l \geq 3$) are negligible for $k\tau \ll 1$.

The initial conditions for the isentropic perturbations in the conformal Newtonian gauge can be obtained either by solving equations (22), (49), and (59), or using the transformations given by equations (17) and (26) (which enables us to relate the amplitudes in the two gauges). We find for the growing mode

Conformal Newtonian gauge —

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_\gamma = -\frac{40C}{15 + 4R_\nu} = -2\psi\,, \qquad \delta_c = \delta_b = \frac{3}{4}\delta_\nu = \frac{3}{4}\delta_\gamma\,, \\ &\theta_\gamma = \theta_\nu = \theta_c = \theta_b = \frac{10C}{15 + 4R_\nu}(k^2\tau) = \frac{1}{2}(k^2\tau)\psi\,, \\ &\Theta_\nu = \frac{4C}{3(15 + 4R_\nu)}(k\tau)^2 = \frac{1}{15}(k\tau)^2\psi\,, \\ &\psi = \frac{20C}{15 + 4R_\nu}\,, \qquad \phi = \left(1 + \frac{2}{5}R_\nu\right)\psi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

The massive neutrino moments Ψ_l in this gauge are related to δ_ν, θ_ν, and Θ_ν by the same equations (eq. 78) as in the synchronous gauge. As claimed earlier, $\psi = \phi$ to zeroth order in $k\tau$ when no neutrinos are present (i.e., $R_\nu = 0$). If we characterize the perturbations in the conformal Newtonian gauge by the potential ψ, all matter and metric variables have a very simple form outside the horizon. The neutrino energy fraction R_ν enters only in the second potential ϕ as a result of the shear stress produced by the free-streaming neutrinos. Bardeen (1980) was concerned that a large shear stress would lead to large metric perturbations in the conformal Newtonian gauge. We see that this does not happen for isentropic growing-mode perturbations in which the shear stress arises solely due to the free-streaming of relativistic collisionless particles.

We see that δ grows with time in the synchronous gauge but remains a constant in the conformal Newtonian gauge before horizon crossing. Another significant difference is the larger value of the velocity perturbations for small $k\tau$ in the conformal Newtonian gauge. Physically, this difference arises because velocity perturbations vanish to lowest order in the synchronous gauge

because the synchronous gauge spatial coordinates are Lagrangian coordinates for freely-falling observers (§2). The next-order velocity perturbations differ for the neutrinos and photons because these two fluids have effectively different equations of state: the neutrinos are collisionless while the photons behave like a perfect fluid due to their strong coupling to the baryons. In the conformal Newtonian gauge, the lowest-order velocity perturbations do not vanish because the conformal Newtonian gauge spatial coordinates are Eulerian coordinates. If we were to include the next-order corrections to θ proportional to $k^4\tau^3$, differences between the different fluid components would appear in equations (79).

In the conformal Newtonian gauge, the mode proportional to D in the synchronous gauge yields $\phi \propto \psi \propto \delta \propto (k\tau)^{-3}$. Thus, this mode corresponds to a decaying mode in the conformal Newtonian gauge even though it yields $\delta \propto (k\tau)$ in the synchronous gauge. The two gauge modes (A and B in eq. 75) do not exist in the conformal Newtonian gauge.

7. Integration Results in a CDM+HDM Model

We apply the results derived in the previous sections to an $\Omega = 1$ cosmological model consisting of a mixture of CDM and HDM, with parameters $\Omega_{\rm cold} = 0.65$, $\Omega_{\rm hot} = 0.3$, $\Omega_{\rm baryon} = 0.05$, and $H_0 = 50$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}. The corresponding neutrino mass is $m_\nu = 93.13\,(\Omega_{\rm hot}h^2)$ eV $= 6.985$ eV.

In Fourier space, all the $\vec{k}$ modes in the linearized Einstein, Boltzmann, and fluid equations evolve independently; thus the equations can be solved for one value of $\vec{k}$ at a time. Moreover, all modes with the same k (the magnitude of the comoving wavevector) evolve the same way. We integrated the equations of motion numerically over the range $0.01\ {\rm Mpc}^{-1} \le k \le 100\ {\rm Mpc}^{-1}$ using 41 points evenly spaced in $\log_{10} k$ with an interval of $\Delta \log_{10} k = 0.1$. The time integration was performed using the standard fifth- and sixth-order Runge-Kutta integrator `dverk` (obtained from netlib@research.att.com). The time integration was begun at conformal time $\tau_0 = 3 \times 10^{-4}$ Mpc with $z \sim 10^9$ and ended at $\tau_f = 3000$ Mpc with $z = 13.55$. The initial τ_0 was chosen so that the largest k (i.e. the smallest wavelength) was well outside the horizon at the onset of the integration. The integration was stopped when the fluctuations were still in the linear regime, with the rms density fluctuation in the CDM component being about 0.2 (Ma & Bertschinger 1994).

The Einstein equations provide redundant equations for the evolution of the metric perturbations. In the synchronous gauge we chose to use $a\dot{h}$ and η as the primary metric perturbation variables in the integration, and used equation (20b) and a combination of (20a) and (20c) as the evolution equations. In the conformal Newtonian gauge we integrated ϕ using equation (22b) and obtained ψ algebraically using (22d). In both gauges we used the time-time Einstein equation (eqs. 20a and 22a) to check integration accuracy. In the conformal Newtonian gauge it is possible to avoid integration of the metric perturbations altogether by combining equations (22a) and (22b) into an algebraic equation for ϕ. However, we found that this gave

numerical difficulties because the initial value of ϕ has to be set with exquisite precision when $k\tau \ll 1$. We also found it necessary to obtain the initial θs from ϕ and the δs in the combined constraint equations of (22a) and (22b). Although the analytical expressions in equations (79) are good approximations for $k\tau \ll 1$, slight deviations from the energy-momentum constraints was found to cause numerical difficulties.

The photon and the massless neutrino phase space distributions were expanded in Legendre series (see eq. 45) with 1000 l-values in order to guarantee sufficient angular resolution. The massive neutrinos are computationally expensive due to the momentum-dependence in equations (54) and (55). We performed the massive neutrino calculations on a grid of 100 q-points including 50 l-values for every q. By setting the phase space harmonics to zero for larger values of l, we found spurious waves which propagate from low to high l, reflect at $l = 50$, and then propagate back to low l. These numerical artifacts are analogous to the propagation of traveling waves on a string with a fixed end. However, only the first three l-terms contribute directly to the source terms in the Einstein equations, and we are not interested in the angular power spectrum of the neutrinos themselves. We found that $l_{\rm max} = 50$ is adequate to ensure that the reflected waves from the cut-off at $l_{\rm max}$ have not interfered with the low-l harmonics. We checked that all of our numerical approximations are adequate by increasing the grids of k, q, and l values as well as decreasing the integration timestep. We estimate that our final results have a relative accuracy better than 10^{-3}.

We shall first present results for the metric perturbations in the conformal Newtonian gauge and then compare the evolution of density perturbations in our two gauges. The metric perturbations in the synchronous gauge have no simple physical interpretation, so we shall not bother presenting them.

Figure 1 shows the time evolution of the metric perturbations $\phi(k,\tau)$ and $\psi(k,\tau)$ in the conformal Newtonian gauge for all 41 values of k. The overall normalization was chosen arbitrarily (corresponding to $C = -1/6$ in eqs. 77 and 79). The difference between ψ and ϕ in the radiation-dominated era is due to the shear stress contributed by the relativistic neutrinos (eq. 79) which make up a fraction $R_\nu = 0.4052$ of the total energy density. On scales much smaller than the horizon, ψ corresponds to the Newtonian gravitational potential and $\phi = \psi$ in the matter-dominated era. As is well known, the potential is constant for growing-mode density perturbations of CDM in an Einstein-de Sitter universe. In a mixed dark matter model, however, the CDM density perturbation growth can be suppressed by the lack of growth of HDM perturbations so that ψ decays slowly.

The behavior of the metric perturbations can be understood as follows. All of the 41 k-modes are outside the horizon at early times when $\tau < 0.01$ Mpc. The horizon eventually "catches up" and a given k-mode crosses inside the horizon when $k\tau$ is about π. The modes with larger k (i.e., shorter wavelengths) enter the horizon earlier. If a given k-mode enters the horizon during the radiation-dominated era, the tight coupling between photons and baryons due

to Thomson scattering induces damped acoustic oscillations in the conformal Newtonian gauge metric perturbations, which are exhibited in Figure 1 by the modes with $k > 0.1$ Mpc^{-1}. (In fact, it is not the speed-of-light horizon that sets the scale for the oscillation and damping of the potential. Rather, as we show below, it is the acoustic horizon. These horizons are similar during the radiation-dominated era because the sound speed of the photon-baryon fluid is $c/\sqrt{3}$.) The modes with $k < 0.1$ Mpc^{-1} enter the horizon during the matter-dominated era and do not oscillate acoustically because the Jeans wavenumber $k_{\rm J} = (4\pi G\bar{\rho}a^2/c_s^2)^{1/2}$ has then become much larger than the wavenumbers under investigation.

We can understand the oscillations more quantitatively by studying the Einstein equations (22) in the conformal Newtonian gauge. Analytical solutions can be found for a perfect fluid with no shear stress, in which case $\phi = \psi$. Using $c_s^2 = \delta P/\delta\rho = \bar{p}/\bar{\rho}$ and $\dot{a}/a = 2\tau^{-1}/(1+3c_s^2)$ (from eqs. 18 and 19), equations (22) can be combined to yield

$$\tau^2\ddot{\phi} + \frac{6(1+c_s^2)}{1+3c_s^2}\tau\dot{\phi} + (kc_s\tau)^2\phi = 0\,, \tag{80}$$

whose solutions are Bessel functions with a power-law pre-factor:

$$\phi_\pm = (kc_s\tau)^{-\nu}J_{\pm\nu}(kc_s\tau)\,, \qquad \nu \equiv \frac{5+3c_s^2}{2(1+3c_s^2)}\,. \tag{81}$$

The ϕ_- solution corresponds to the decaying mode discussed in §6, so we shall ignore it. In the radiation-dominated era, $c_s^2 = \frac{1}{3}$ and $\nu = \frac{3}{2}$, so that

$$\phi_+ = (kc_s\tau)^{-3/2}J_{3/2}(kc_s\tau) \propto \begin{cases} \text{constant}\,, & kc_s\tau \ll 1\,, \\ a^{-2}\cos(kc_s\tau)\,, & kc_s\tau \gg 1\,. \end{cases} \tag{82}$$

This type of behavior is apparent in Figure 1 for $\tau < \tau_{\rm eq}$. This analytic solution holds of course only in the absence of neutrinos; obtaining the correct amplitudes for ψ and ϕ in CDM+HDM models shown in Figure 1 required the full integration discussed in this paper.

After the universe becomes matter-dominated, acoustic damping of the potential ceases, and the only physical process causing the potential to change is the free-streaming damping of perturbations in the massive neutrinos. We shall discuss this further after examining the evolution of the density perturbations.

Figure 2 shows the evolution of the density perturbations for the five particle species in the two gauges from our numerical integration. Three wavenumbers are plotted: $k = 0.01$ Mpc^{-1} (Fig. 2a), $k = 0.1$ Mpc^{-1} (Fig. 2b), and $k = 1.0$ Mpc^{-1} (Fig. 2c). Each mode is normalized with the same initial amplitude for ϕ as in Figure 1. There are several notable features:

Before horizon crossing —

(1) The initial amplitudes of the δ's are related by the isentropic initial conditions: $\delta_\gamma = \delta_\nu = \delta_h = 4\delta_b/3 = 4\delta_c/3$. The behavior of δ outside the horizon is strongly gauge-dependent.

In the synchronous gauge, Figure 2 shows that all the δ's before horizon crossing in the radiation-dominated era grow as a^2. This confirms equations (77) since $a(\tau) \propto \tau$ at this time. It is straightforward to show that in the matter-dominated era (for Ω=1), $\delta \propto \tau^2 \propto a$ for all modes before horizon crossing. In the conformal Newtonian gauge, the δ's remain constant outside the horizon as derived in equations (79). After horizon crossing, however, the perturbations come into causal contact and become nearly independent of the coordinate choices. As one can see, δ_c, δ_b, and δ_h in the two gauges are almost identical at late times. In fact, one can show using equations (22) and (26a) that if ψ = constant, then $\delta(\mathrm{Syn}) - \delta(\mathrm{Con}) = 2\psi$, accounting for the slight differences apparent in the figures.

After horizon crossing —

(2) For CDM, the k-modes that enter the horizon during the radiation-dominated era behave very differently from those entering in the matter-dominated era. The critical scale separating the two is the horizon distance at the epoch of radiation-matter equality ($a_{\rm eq} \sim 10^{-4}$): $k_{\rm eq} = 2\pi/\tau_{\rm eq} \sim 0.1$ Mpc^{-1} for our parameters. For the modes with $k > 0.1$, horizon crossing occurs when the energy density of the universe is dominated by radiation; thus the fluctuations in the CDM can not grow appreciably during this time. For the photons and the baryons, the important scale is the horizon size at recombination ($a_{\rm rec} \sim 10^{-3}$): $k_{\rm rec} = 2\pi/\tau_{\rm rec} \sim 0.025$ Mpc^{-1}. The modes with $k > 0.025$ (see Figs. 2b and 2c) enter the horizon before recombination, so the photons (long-dashed curves) and baryons (dash-dotted curves) oscillate acoustically while they are coupled by Thomson scattering. The coupling is not perfect. The friction of the photons dragging against the baryons leads to Silk damping (Silk 1968), which is prominent in Figure 2c at $a \sim 10^{-3.5}$. The baryons decouple from the photons at recombination and then fall very quickly into the potential wells formed around the CDM, resulting in the rapid growth of δ_b in Figures 2b and 2c.

(3) Neutrinos decouple from other species at $T \sim 1$ MeV and $a \sim 10^{-10}$. At this early time, both the massless and the 7 eV massive neutrinos behave like relativistic collisionless particles. The massive neutrinos become non-relativistic when $3k_{\rm B}T_\nu \sim m_\nu$, corresponding to $a_{\rm nr} \sim 7 \times 10^{-5}$ for 7 eV neutrinos. Close inspection of the figures at $a \approx a_{\rm nr}$ reveals that δ_h (short-dashed curve) is indeed making a gradual transition from the upper line for the radiation fields to the lower line for the matter fields. Although the Jeans length of a fluid is not well defined for collisionless particles such as the neutrinos, the criterion for free-streaming damping is similar to the Jeans criterion for gravitational stability: free-streaming is important for $k > k_{\rm fs}$, where $k_{\rm fs}^2(a) = 4\pi G\bar{\rho}a^2/\langle v^2\rangle$ and $\langle v^2\rangle^{1/2}$ is the neutrino velocity dispersion. When the neutrinos are relativistic, $v \sim 1$ and $k_{\rm fs}(a) \propto a^{-1}$ for $a < a_{\rm eq}$. After the neutrinos become non-relativistic, the neutrino speed is given by $\langle v^2\rangle^{1/2} \sim 3k_{\rm B}T_\nu/m_\nu = 3k_{\rm B}T_{0,\nu}/a\,m_\nu$, implying $\langle v^2\rangle^{1/2} \sim 15a^{-1}(m_\nu/10\,\mathrm{eV})^{-1}$ km s^{-1}. In the matter-dominated era, we have $4\pi G\bar{\rho}a^2 = \frac{3}{2}H_0^2 a^{-1}$ from the Friedmann equation, and therefore

$$k_{\rm fs}(a) = 8\,a^{1/2}\left(\frac{m_\nu}{10\mathrm{eV}}\right)h\,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}\,. \tag{83}$$

In Figure 2a, since horizon crossing occurs when the free-streaming effect is already unimportant,

the evolution of δ_h is very similar to that of CDM. In Figures 2b and 2c, however, the free streaming effect is evident and the growth of δ_h is suppressed until $k_{\rm fs}(a)$ grows to $\sim k$. After $k_{\rm fs}(a) > k$, δ_h can grow again and catch up to δ_c. Since $k_{\rm fs} \propto a^{1/2}$, the larger k modes suffer more free-streaming damping and δ_h can not grow until later times. The damping in δ_h also affects the growth of δ_c, slowing it down more for larger $\Omega_{\rm hot}$ compared to the pure CDM model. This effect is also apparent in the power spectra shown in, for example, Ma & Bertschinger (1994).

8. Summary

Physical quantities are independent of the coordinate systems they are computed in. For historical reasons, most calculations of linear fluctuation growth have been carried out in the synchronous gauge. In this paper we explored an alternative gauge, the conformal Newtonian gauge, which is free of the gauge ambiguities and coordinate singularities associated with the synchronous gauge. We derived the coordinate transformation relating the two gauges and presented the linear theory of isentropic scalar gravitational perturbations in parallel for both gauges. The complete set of evolution equations are given: the Einstein equations for the metric perturbations, the Boltzmann equations for the photon and neutrino phase space distributions, and the fluid equations for CDM and baryons.

The use of the conformal Newtonian gauge was motivated by our work on the HDM initial conditions in CDM+HDM models (Ma & Bertschinger 1994). In order to sample the neutrino phase space accurately for an N-body simulation, we followed individual neutrino trajectories by numerically integrating the geodesic equations in a perturbed Friedmann-Robertson-Walker background metric. The conformal Newtonian gauge proved to be the most convenient choice for this calculation because the geodesic equations have simple forms and the coordinates do not become seriously deformed at late times.

In this paper we applied the linear theory to the CDM+HDM model under study: $\Omega_{\rm cold} = 0.65$, $\Omega_{\rm hot} = 0.3$, $\Omega_{\rm baryon} = 0.05$, and H_0=50 km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}. The evolution of the density fields for all five particle species in both gauges was presented. We also illustrated the gauge dependence of the density fields before horizon crossing and discussed the physical interpretation of the results.

Interested users may obtain our programs to integrate the perturbation equations by contacting one of the authors.

We appreciate the advice and comments of Alan Guth. This work was supported by NSF grant AST90-01762 and DOE grant DE-AC02-76ER03069. The numerical work was carried out in part on the Convex C3880 provided by the National Center for Supercomputing Applications. C.-P. Ma acknowledges Fellowship support from the Division of Physics, Mathematics, and

Astronomy at Caltech. E.B. would like to thank John Bahcall for his hospitality at the Institute for Advanced Study during the completion of this work.

REFERENCES

Bardeen, J. M. 1980, Phys. Rev., D22, 1882

Bertschinger, E. 1993, in Statistical Description of Transport in Plasma, Astro-, and Nuclear Physics, ed. J. Misguich, G. Pelletier & P. Schuck, (Editions Frontières: Gif sur Yvette), in press

Bond, J. R. & Szalay, A. 1983, ApJ, 276, 443

Dodelson, S. & Jubas, J. 1993, Fermilab-Pub-93/242-A, preprint

Durrer, R. 1993, ZU-TH14/92, preprint

Jackson, J. D. 1975, Classical Electrodynamics (Wiley, New York)

Kodama, H. & Sasaki, M. 1984, Prog. Theo. Phys. Suppl. 78, 1

Lifshitz, E. M. 1946, J. Phys. USSR, 10, 116

Lifshitz, E. M. & Khalatnikov, I. M. 1963, Adv. Phys., 12, 185

Ma, C.-P. & Bertschinger, E. 1994, ApJ, 429, in press

Mukhanov, V. F., Feldman, H. A. & Brandenberger, R. 1992, Phys. Rep., 215, 206

Peebles, P. J. E. 1968, ApJ, 153, 1

Peebles, P. J. E. 1980, The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe (Princeton University Press, Princeton)

Peebles, P. J. E. 1993, Principles of Physical Cosmology (Princeton University Press, Princeton)

Peebles, P. J. E. & Yu, J. T. 1970, ApJ, 162, 815

Press, W. H. & Vishniac, E. T. 1980, ApJ, 239, 1

Ratra, B. 1988, Phys. Rev., D38, 2399

Silk, J. 1968, ApJ, 151, 459

Spitzer, L. 1978, Physical Processes in the Interstellar Medium, (Wiley, New York)

Weinberg, S. 1972, Gravitation and Cosmology (Wiley, New York)

Wilson, M. L., & Silk, J. 1980, Phys. Scripta, 21, 708

Wilson, M. L., & Silk, J. 1981, ApJ, 243, 14

This preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v3.0.

Fig. 1.— The scalar metric perturbations $\phi(k,\tau)$ (Fig. 1a) and $\psi(k,\tau)$ (Fig. 1b) in the conformal Newtonian gauge as a function of τ. The 41 curves from left to right correspond to 41 values of k between 100.0 Mpc^{-1} and 0.01 Mpc^{-1}. The labels τ_{nr}, τ_{eq} and τ_{rec} indicate the time 7 eV neutrinos become non-relativistic, the matter-radiation equality time, and the recombination time, respectively.

Fig. 2.— Evolution of the density fields in the synchronous gauge (top panels) and the conformal Newtonian gauge (bottom panels) for 3 wavenumbers k= 0.01 (Fig. 2a), 0.1 (Fig. 2b) and 1.0 (Fig. 2c) Mpc^{-1}. In each figure, the five lines represent $\delta_c, \delta_b, \delta_\gamma, \delta_\nu$ and δ_h for the CDM (solid curve), baryon (dash-dotted), photon (long-dashed), massless neutrino (dotted), and massive neutrino (short-dashed) components, respectively.